UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,834	01/24/2001	Greg Arnold	PALM-3561.US.P	5518

7590 05/14/2004

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
LIEN, TAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	4

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/769,834	ARNOLD, GREG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tan Lien	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim(s) 1-4, 8-10, 12-14, and 18-20 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070).

Claim(s) 1, 12: Frantz discloses a method of using an email message to control a computer resource, comprising:

receiving an email message from a sender (col. 4, lines 44-48; wherein the email message is sent by the technician and received by the email interface device);

recognizing a reserved command word within the email message (col. 4, lines 44-50);

interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource (col. 4, lines 59-64; wherein the email interpreter is referenced in FIG. 1 reference number 16 of Frantz, and the available computer resource is the data base {FIG. 1 ref. 24 of Frantz} or equipment {FIG. 1, ref. 20}); and

generating a command for execution on the available computer resource (col. 4, lines 59-64).

Claim(s) 2, 13: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a result from the available computer resource (col. 4, lines 62-64); and

sending a reply email message communicating the result to the sender (col. 4, lines 62-64).

Claim(s) 3, 14: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the computer resource comprises a computer database (col. 4, line 60 and col. 6, lines 63-64), the command comprises a database query (col. 4, line 60) and wherein the result comprises the result of the database query (col. 4, lines 59-64).

Claim(s) 4, 20: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the resource comprises a computer database (col. 4, line 60 and col. 6, lines 63-64) and the command comprises a database query (col. 4, line 60).

Claim(s) 8, 18: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 1, carried out on a programmed processor (FIG. 1, ref. 16 of Frantz) protected by a firewall (col. 3, lines 39-43).

Claim(s) 9, 19: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 8, wherein the programmed processor comprises a server (FIG. 1, ref. 16 of Frantz; wherein the email interpreter and generator servers equipment, database, and other things) providing an intralan (assumed to an intranet or LAN) resource (FIG. 1, ref. 10 of Frantz; wherein intralan is the component that connects the printer, terminal, equipment, database, and email interpreter/generator) within the firewall (col. 3, lines 39-43).

Claim(s) 10: Frantz discloses the method according to claim 1, carried out by executing a set of machine readable instructions stored on an electronic storage medium (col. 5, lines 61-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 5, 6, and 15 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,864,684).

Claim(s) 5, 15: Frantz discloses a method as described in claim 1 and 12 respectively above. Frantz fails to disclose the reserved command word comprising a part of a

subject portion of the email message. Nielsen, however, teaches a "SUSPEND" command in the Subject: field-body of the message (col. 10, lines 11-15 of Nielsen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nielsen's teaching of command words as part of the subject portion of the email message into Frantz's subject portion of the email because it would allow Frantz's method to use it as a command to suspend the address of the subscriber (col. 10, lines 14-17 of Nielsen).

Claim(s) 6: Frantz discloses a method as described in claim 1 above. Frantz fails to disclose the interpreting comprises parsing the email message into parts defining the computer resource and the command. Nielsen, however, teaches parsing of a "SUSPEND" command (col. 10, lines 33-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nielsen's teaching of parsing a suspended command into Frantz's email method of parsing the email message into parts defining the computer resource and the command. The reason why Frantz's method would parse the suspend command into parts defining the subscriber's address portion is because Frantz wanted to notify the subscriber of the suspension via the subscriber's address (col. 10, lines 33-35).

Claim(s) 7, 16, and 17 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view of Safari Tech Books Online, PalmPilot: The Ultimate Guide, Second Edition by David Pogue, hereinafter referred to as Pogue.

Claim(s) 7,16,17: Frantz discloses a method as described in claims 1 and 12 respectively above. Frantz fails to disclose the sending of the email message from the sender originates at a palmtop computer. Pogue, however, teaches the use of email applications in a PalmPilot (chapter 5.6 Mail). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Frantz to use the palmtop computer to send the email message. The motivation would be to carry the light-weight computer anywhere for reading en route or in hotel room (chapter 10, PalmPilot: The Electronic Book).

Claim(s) 11 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,864,684) and Pogue (PalmPilot).

Claim(s) 11: Frantz discloses a method of using an email message to control a computer resource, comprising:

receiving an email message from a sender (col. 4, lines 44-48 of Frantz);

recognizing a reserved word in the email message (col. 4, lines 44-50);

interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource (col. 4, lines59-64);

generating a command (col. 4, lines 59-64 of Frantz) as a database query (col. 4, line 60 of Frantz) for execution on the computer database (col. 4, line 60 and col. 6, lines 63-64 of Frantz);

receiving a result from the available computer database (col. 4, lines 62-64 of Frantz); and

sending a reply email message communicating the result to the sender (col. 4, lines 62-64 of Frantz).

Frantz discloses a method of receiving an email message from a sender but fails to disclose the sender of the message originates at a palmtop computer. Pogue, however, teaches the use of email applications in a PalmPilot (chapter 5.6 Mail). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Frantz to use the palmtop computer to send the email message. The motivation would be to carry the light-weight computer anywhere for reading en route or in hotel room (chapter 10, PalmPilot: The Electronic Book).

Frantz discloses a method of recognizing a reserved word in the email message but fails to disclose the reserved command word comprising a part of a subject portion of the email message. Nielsen, however, teaches a "SUSPEND" command in the Subject: field-body of the message (col. 10, lines 11-15 of

Nielsen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nielsen's teaching of command words as part of the subject portion of the email message into Frantz's subject portion of the email because it would allow Frantz's method to use it as a command to suspend the address of the subscriber (col. 10, lines 14-17 of Nielsen).

Frantz discloses a method for interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource but fails to disclose the interpreting comprises parsing the email message into parts defining the computer resource and the command. Nielsen, however, teaches parsing of a "SUSPEND" command (col. 10, lines 33-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nielsen's teaching of parsing a suspended command into Frantz's email method of parsing the email message into parts defining the computer resource and the command. The reason why Frantz's method would parse the suspend command into parts defining the subscriber's address portion is because Frantz wanted to notify the subscriber of the suspension via the subscriber's address (col. 10, lines 33-35).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (703) 305-6018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY